



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/613,059	07/02/2003	James M. Sangroniz	100110746-1	6668
22879	7590	12/28/2007	EXAMINER	
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			SHECHTMAN, CHERYL MARIA	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2163				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
12/28/2007		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM  
mkraft@hp.com  
ipa.mail@hp.com

AK

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/613,059	SANGRONIZ, JAMES M.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Cheryl M. Shechtman	2163	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 September 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-9, 15-26 and 30-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-9, 15-26 and 30-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 02 July 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to Amendment filed September 18, 2007.

Claims 1-9, 15-26 and 30-33 are pending. Claims 10-14 and 27-29 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 15, 20, 30, and 31 are amended.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Referring to the 35 USC 112 second paragraph rejection of claims 1, 15, 20, and 31, Applicant's amendments to the claims and arguments on pages 8-9 of the Remarks section filed September 18, 2007 are acknowledged. As such, the 35 USC 112 second paragraph rejection of the claims is withdrawn.

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-9, 15-26 and 30-33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1, 15, 20, 30, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent 7,065,567 issued to Squires et al (hereafter Squires).

Referring to claim 1, Squires discloses a workflow management device ('printing workflow system', Abstract; Fig. 1, element 2; Fig. 2, element 2; Fig. 3, element 20) comprising:

- a communications interface configured to receive a user request (input module receives document processing (print) jobs, Fig. 3, element 24; col. 3, lines 58-64) comprising one or more user-desired product properties associated with a user-desired product (print job characteristics, col. 4, line 60 –col. 5, line 10; see also Fig. 7, elements 46, 48 and 50), the interface further configured to communicate with one or more workflow processing devices located external of the workflow management device (see devices 5 and 7, Fig. 1; Fig. 8, elements 77-79);
- a storage device configured to store predefined rules data for processing the user request ('Storage' contains programming instructions to manage document processing jobs, Fig. 3, element 23; col. 3, line 58 – col. 4, line 2; 'Storage' also stores 'capacities' and 'capabilities' predefined rules, col. 4, lines 14-27); and
- processing circuitry ('Processor', Fig. 3, element 22) configured to process the user request using the predefined rules data to produce a transformed user request without communicating with the one or more workflow processing devices ('job decomposition module' processes print jobs into sub-jobs based on capacity and capability predefined rules, col. 4, lines 11-36; col. 5, lines 29-54; Fig. 8, element 64), the transformed user request including information for automatically organizing workflow among the one or more workflow processing devices in accordance with the one or more user-desired product properties to

achieve the user-desired product via the one or more workflow processing devices (col. 5, lines 42-54; Fig. 8).

Referring to claim 15, the limitations of the claim are similar to those of claim 1 above in the form of a system (Squire, Abstract). As such, claim 15 is also rejected for the same reasons as claim 1. Claim 15 additionally recites managing workflow in a printing system (Squires, Abstract) and one or more workflow processing devices (Squire, Fig. 1, elements 5 and 7; Fig. 8, elements 77-79).

Referring to claim 20, Squires discloses a workflow assignment method (Abstract; Summary) comprising:

- receiving a user request at a server (Fig. 1, element 2; Fig. 2, element 2; Fig. 3, element 20; col. 3, lines 58-64), the request having one or more user-desired product properties (print job characteristics, col. 4, line 60 – col. 5, line 10; see also Fig. 7, elements 46, 48 and 50);
- providing in the server a prestored stylesheet having predefined rules for processing the user request ('capacities' and 'capabilities' predefined rules in storage, col. 4, lines col. 4, line 11 – col. 5, line 15; Fig. 5-7);
- loading the predefined rules and the user request into a processing circuitry of the server, the circuitry configured to process the user request ('Processor', Fig. 3, element 22; col. 3, line 58 – col. 4, line 36; Fig. 3 and 4); and

- without communicating with one or more workflow processing devices, executing the predefined rules on the server to create a transformed user request ('job decomposition module' processes print jobs into sub-jobs based on capacity and capability predefined rules, col. 4, lines 11-36; col. 5, lines 29-54; Fig. 8; element 64), the transformed user request comprising additional information to automatically organize workflow among the one or more workflow processing devices in accordance with the one or more user-desired product properties to produce a user-desired product (col. 5, lines 42-54; Fig. 8).

Referring to claim 30, the limitations of the claim are similar to those of claim 20 above in the form of a system (Squire, Abstract). As such, claim 30 is also rejected for the same reasons as claim 20.

Referring to claim 31, the limitations of the claim are similar to those of claim 20 above in the form of an article of manufacture (Squire, Abstract; col. 2, lines 42-46). As such, claim 30 is also rejected for the same reasons as claim 20. Claim 31 additionally recites processor usable media embodying programming (col. 3, line 58 – col. 4, line 2).

Referring to claim 2, Squires discloses that the transformed user request is received by a controller external to the workflow management device, the controller configured to control the workflow in accordance with the one or more user-desired

product properties (product cell controller, col. 3, line 58 - col. 4, line 3; Fig. 3, element 16; col. 4, lines 27-36).

Referring to claim 3, Squires discloses that the transformed request comprises additional information to process the user request in accordance with specifications of the user and the additional information comprises information to route and process the workflow in accordance with the one or more user-desired properties, and information to prioritize processing of the workflow in accordance with the one or more user-desired product properties (Fig. 7, 9; col. 5, line 55 – col. 6, line 14).

Referring to claims 16 and 21, Squires discloses a controller external to the workflow management device and the one or more workflow processing devices, the controller configured to receive the transformed request, and route the transformed request among the one or more workflow processing devices for processing in accordance with the one or more user-desired product properties using information from the transformed request (product cell controller, col. 3, line 58 - col. 4, line 3; Fig. 3, element 16; col. 4, lines 27-36; Fig. 7, 9; col. 5, line 55 – col. 6, line 14).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 4, 5, 17, 22, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Squires, as applied to claims 1, 15, and 20 respectively, and further in view of US Publication 2002/0184240 by Volkoff et al (hereafter Volkoff).

Referring to claims 4, 17, and 22, Squires discloses all of the above claimed subject matter, however remains silent as to a job definition format (JDP) for a user request.

However, Volkoff teaches job definition formats for service or job requests (para. 34).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Squires to include a job definition format for requests, as taught by Volkoff.

The ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Squires per the above for the purpose of adhering to a definition formatting standard (Volkoff, para 34).

Referring to claim 24, the combination of Squires/Volkoff discloses receiving the user request via the Internet (Volkoff, para. 34).

Referring to claim 5, Squires discloses all of the above claimed subject matter, however remains silent as to receiving the user request via the Internet.

However, Volkoff teaches receiving a user request via the Internet (para. 34).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Squires to include receiving a user request via the Internet, as taught by Volkoff.

The ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Squires per the above for the purpose of allowing a broad spectrum of communications between entities (Volkoff, para 35).

6. Claims 6-9, 18, 19, 23, 25, 26, 32, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Squires, as applied to claims 1, 15, and 20 respectively, and further in view of US Patent 6,507,857 issued to Yalcinalp.

Referring to claims 6, 18, and 23, Squires discloses all of the above claimed subject matter, however remains silent as to instructions written in Extensible Stylesheet Language.

However, Yalcinalp teaches instructions written in Extensible Stylesheet Language (col. 6, lines 55-57).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Squires to include instructions written in Extensible Stylesheet Language, as taught by Yalcinalp.

The ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Squires per the above for the purpose of allowing the content of documents to be transformed thereby providing greater flexibility and control over the display of a document's content (Yalcinalp, col. 1, lines 20-25).

Referring to claims 7 and 25, Squires discloses all of the above claimed subject matter, however remains silent as to an extensible stylesheet language transformation (XSLT) processor.

However, Yalcinalp teaches an extensible stylesheet language transformation (XSLT) processor (Fig. 1, element 110).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Squires to include an extensible stylesheet language transformation (XSLT) processor, as taught by Yalcinalp.

The ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Squires per the above for the purpose of allowing the content of documents to be transformed thereby providing greater flexibility and control over the display of a document's content (Yalcinalp, col. 1, lines 20-25).

Referring to claims 8 and 19, Squires discloses all of the above claimed subject matter, however remains silent as to an extensible stylesheet language transformation (XSL) to the user request to produce the transformed user request.

However, Yalcinalp teaches an extensible stylesheet language transformation transformation (XSL) to a user request to produce a transformed user request (col. 5, lines 61-64).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Squires to include an extensible stylesheet language

transformation transformation (XSL) to a user request to produce a transformed user request, as taught by Yalcinalp.

The ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Squires per the above for the purpose of allowing the content of documents to be transformed thereby providing greater flexibility and control over the display of a document's content (Yalcinalp, col. 1, lines 20-25).

Referring to claim 26, Squires discloses all of the above claimed subject matter, and also discloses that the transformed user request comprises a definition of workflow tasks to be performed, and settings and properties for the workflow tasks, configured to produce a user-desired product in accordance with the one or more user-desired product properties (Fig. 7, 9; col. 5, line 55 – col. 6, line 14).

However, Squire remains silent as to applying the predefined rules using an extensible stylesheet language transformation transformation (XSL) to the user request.

However, Yalcinalp teaches applying predefined rules using an extensible stylesheet language transformation transformation (XSL) to a user request (col. 5, lines 61-64).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Squires to include applying predefined rules using an extensible stylesheet language transformation transformation (XSL) to a user request, as taught by Yalcinalp.

The ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Squires per the above for the purpose of allowing the content of documents to be transformed thereby providing greater flexibility and control over the display of a document's content (Yalcinalp, col. 1, lines 20-25).

Referring to claim 9, Squires discloses all of the above claimed subject matter and also discloses storing predefined rules data in at least one stylesheet within the storage device (col. 4, lines col. 4, line 11 – col. 5, line 15; Fig. 5-7).

However, Squires remains silent as to instructions written in Extensible Stylesheet Language (XSL) format.

However, Yalcinalp teaches instructions written in Extensible Stylesheet Language (XSL) format (col. 6, lines 55-57).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Squires to include instructions written in Extensible Stylesheet Language (XSL) format, as taught by Yalcinalp.

The ordinary skilled artisan would have been motivated to modify Squires per the above for the purpose of allowing the content of documents to be transformed thereby providing greater flexibility and control over the display of a document's content (Yalcinalp, col. 1, lines 20-25).

Referring to claim 32, the combination of Squires/Yalcinalp discloses that each stylesheet corresponds to a different subset of the product properties (Squires, Fig. 4, element 48; Fig. 7).

Referring to claim 33, the combination of Squires/Yalcinalp discloses that the transformed user request generated by a first one of the stylesheets has a different workflow than the transformed user request generated by a second one of the stylesheets (Squires, see sub-workflows, Fig. 4).

### ***Conclusion***

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cheryl M Shechtman who can be reached on (571) 272-4018. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Don Wong can be reached on (571) 272-1834. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

December 18, 2007  
CMS



DON WONG  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100